

REMARKS

It is desired to thank the Examiner for the courtesy of a mid-January telephone interview in the course of which applicants' counsel received the benefit of the Office interpretation of the relevance of the Dubus patent to applicants' claims 24, 29 and 34 [and dependent claim 26] (voice-command switching of just the cellular radio telephone). As a result, applicants have withdrawn these claims at this time.

At said interview, applicants' counsel, however, invited the attention of the Examiner to the actual irrelevance of the Dubus patent to applicants' claims 25, 30 and 31 [and their corresponding dependent claims 14 and 16-20, 22 and 27] (separate voice commands for respective separate switching of vehicle radio-entertainment deck separate components--player, recorder, radio-receiver--); and to applicants' claims 23, 28, 32 and 33 (separate voice commands for respective separate switching of vehicle radio-entertainment deck separate components together with further voice-command switching also of the cellular radio telephone).

With regard to claims 25, 30 and 31, while Dubus does indeed refer to a radio 9, this is actually not used for a radio-program reception entertainment function but only to borrow its amplifier-loudspeaker circuit for the convenience of hearing the "radio telephone 12...speech" (col. 4, lines 1-30; claim 8).

More than this, there is absolutely no disclosure of, suggestion or even purpose for a pre-designated voice command for switching the car radio 9 or the demodulator 8, and certainly not any separate voice commands for respectively switching a plurality of separate entertainment deck components as called for in claims 25, 30 and 31, and also in their dependent claims 14 and 16-20, 22 and 27, and further also in claims 23, 28, 32 and 33.

With regard to the latter claims 23, 28, 32 and 33, moreover, the facility for respective voice-command switching of both a plurality of the respective entertainment deck components, together with voice-command switching of the cellular radio telephone enables added features of applicants' invention, where desired--also totally absent in Dubus--of providing the capability, for example, of recording the driver's voice dictation on the entertainment deck recorder component

while at the same time transmitting the dictation over the cellular telephone to a remote office (see, for example, page 12 of the specification). Such a feature of simultaneous operation of an entertainment deck component and relaying of the component output also over the cellular telephone is also effectible with other of the entertainment deck components, as well, such as with the deck tape player (page 11), and the AM/FM radio receiver (page 8).

No such concept is even hinted at, let alone disclosed, in Dubus or in any possible combination of the cited references.

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 23, 25, 28, 30, 31, 33 and respective dependent claims 14, 16-20, 22, 27 and 32 are therefore believed to be in order and are accordingly respectfully requested.

Again, applicants express their appreciation for the opportunity of the clarifying telephone interview with the Examiner, above described.

Any costs, including for any extensions of time required herein, petition for which is hereby made, are to be charged to Deposit Account No. 18-1425 of the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

RINES AND RINES

By: 

Robert H. Rines
Registration No. 15,932

Date: March 7, 2003
RINES AND RINES
81 North State Street
Concord, NH 03301
Tel: (603) 228-0121